

REMARKS

Applicants' representative hereby provisionally elects the invention of alleged Group I, Claims 1-19, for further prosecution on the merits. This restriction is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested. No undue burden will be placed on the Examiner to search for and examine all of the alleged species especially given the significant overlap of searching classes and subclasses. Furthermore, it is requested that the Examiner recombine claim Groups I and II given the previous amendment to Claim 20 (which was not made for patentability reasons). The Examiner appears to be improperly placing form over substance with regard to Groups I and II. The Examiner's arguments in paragraph No. 3 regarding a "static warehouse shelving system" are certainly "creative" but not understood given the present claims. It is suggested that time could be better spent examining all of the claims rather than continuing this line of argumentation.

Furthermore, the alleged Species B, Figure 4, is elected and the following claims read on the elected species of Figure 4: 1-22 and 24. The following claims are generic to all of the alleged species: 1-4, 6-9, 20, 22 and 24. Moreover, at least the following additional claims are generic to the alleged species of Figures 3 and 4: 12-19 and 21. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 12, 2006

By: 

Monte L. Falcoff, Reg. No. 37,617

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MLF/lkj